Knowledge of the Ape in Antiquity
Author(s): M. F. Ashley Montagu
Source: *Isis*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Jul., 1940), pp. 87-102
Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of The History of Science Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/226056
Accessed: 09/05/2014 16:02

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The University of Chicago Press and *The History of Science Society* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Isis.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Knowledge of the Ape in Antiquity

In a recently published work (1) Professor W. C. McDermott has collected together a considerable portion of the available data relating to the knowledge of the apes possessed by the peoples of antiquity; that is to say, by the peoples, principally, living around and about the Mediterranean basin. In addition the author treats of the ape in art, as a pet, as a source of humour, and as an evil beast. McDermott uses the term ape as a general name for all the infra-human primates; from his text it is clear that the Lemuroidea are excluded from the groups of primates which the term ape is intended to embrace. For this practise there is considerable authority both in classical usage and in Renaissance systematics, although in the parlance of the learned the term ape (*πίθηκος*) has, ever since the days of Aristotle, been more or less generally used to refer to a primate lacking a tail, or to one possessing but a vestige of a tail, as distinguished from primates possessing an appreciable caudal appendage (2). The terms first used by Aristotle to distinguish the various groups of primates known to him were *πίθηκος* (ape), *κυνοκέφαλος* (baboon), and *κῆβος* (monkey), and among the learned these terms have persisted in customary usage with practically their original meanings to this day. But this is the usage of specialists who, until very recent times, when they wished to refer to the monkeys and apes

(1) William Coffman McDermott, *The Ape in Antiquity*, The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 27, pp. xi + 338, Plates X. Baltimore : The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938, ($5.00).

(2) Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, Lib. 2, Cap. 8-9; Linnaeus, *Systema Naturae*, Holmiae, 1760, Lib. 6, p. 63, Editio 12, (the last edition to be issued during Linné's lifetime); A. A. H. Lichtenstein, *Commentatio philologica de simiarum quotquot veteribus innotuerunt formis earumque nominibus pro specimine methodi qua historia naturalis veterum ad systema naturae Linnaeanum exigenda atque adornanda*, Hamburg, 1791; cf. also R. M. Yerkes and A. W. Yerkes, *The Great Apes*, New Haven, 1929, pp. 36-37.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

in general used the common word ape (3). This was the usage adopted and followed by the writers of the first modern comparative anatomy (4). Since this work is none too well known I shall take the liberty of quoting the relevant passage here. It is the first paragraph of the chapter entitled " Description Anatomique De Plusieurs Singes De Differentes Especes."

" L'ON reduit ordinairement les Singes sous deux genres, dont l'un est des Singes qui ont des queuës, & l'autre de ceux qui n'en ont point. Le Singe qui est sans queuë est appellé simplement *Simia* par les Latins. Les Singes qui ont une queuë sont de deux especes. Les Latins ont emprunté des Grecs les noms qu'ils leur donnent : car les uns sont appellés *Cercopytheci*, du nom du genre, c'est-à-dire, Singes qui ont une queuë; les autres *Cynocephali*, c'est-à-dire, qui ont une tête de Chien, a cause de la longueur de leur museau."

In this passage the use of the term " Singe " represents the typical usage of the term " ape," a use which is so well established as to render it the only possible term which McDERMOTT could have used for the purpose he had in view. The common usage by which any of the infrahuman primates—with the exception of the Lemurs—may be termed an ape is the sense in which McDERMOTT uses the term, and this is the sense in which we may justly understand it throughout his book.

In Part I the author deals with the various aspects of his subject in a clear and interesting manner, and in Part II he provides an annotated Catalogue as well as an extensive Bibliography relating

(3) It may be worth noting here that there does not at the present time exist a word in the English language which may serve as a term for all the primates. It is unlikely that the classificatory term " primate " will ever come into common usage, in any case, the latter term is already reserved by the Church to describe the chief ecclesiastic, and we must be careful here, *acerrima proximorum odia !*

(4) *Memoires Pour Servir A L'Histoire Naturelle Des Animaux*, Paris, A L'Imprimerie Royale, 1671-76, 2 volumes folio. This truly magnificent work was at first issued anonymously and distributed as a royal gift by LOUIS XIV, and is extremely rare. It was reissued in 1676 in one volume bearing the name of C. PERRAULT as editor. An English translation of the latter edition was made by ALEXANDER PITFIELD, approved for printing by a Council of the Royal Society 17 November 1686, and published at London in 1688. For this edition the original beautiful plates were entirely redrawn by RICHARD WALLER. The title of the English translation is " *Memoir's For A Natural History of Animals. Containing The Anatomical Descriptions Of Several Creatures Dissected By The Royal Academy Of Sciences At Paris.*"

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

to the materials discussed in the text. McDERMOTT's monograph is the most exhaustive treatment of its subject which has thus far appeared, and replaces LICHTENSTEIN's and all previous works of a similar nature as the authoritative work on the ape in Antiquity. In view of the fact that the author is a Latinist without any special knowledge of the primates he is to be heartily congratulated upon the careful manner in which he has treated the systematic side of his subject—a quicksand into which more than one careful investigator has fallen inextricably (5). On several occasions, however, the author permits himself a daring inference from slender evidence, and the presentation of a conclusion which is at once unorthodox as well as challenging. It is with the material of these occasions that I propose to deal here.

Early in the work occurs the following paragraph :

" During the period which followed the downfall of the Minoan-Mycenean civilization Cyprus played an important part in the transmission of the Oriental influence which played so large a part in the rise of Greek civilization. As might be expected, the proximity of Phoenician traders resulted in the importation into Cyprus of various objects which show Egyptian and Assyrian influence. Most striking of the finds which concern the subject at hand are two gilded silver bowls which in their relief decoration combine Egyptian and Assyrian motives. One was found at Praeneste and the other at Curium on Cyprus, but both seem to be from the same workshop, and are of Phoenician-Cypriote workmanship. Since in the main scene they may portray Cinyras, who was the legendary founder of Amathus, Curium and other cities of Cyprus, they may have been made on the island of Cyprus, or at least with Cyprus in mind as a market. This main scene shows the hunting of deer and of a gorilla. These bowls date about 700 B.C." (p. 24).

Now, what is so startling about this paragraph is that in it

(5) Of all the fields of mammalian taxonomy that which relates to the primates still remains in the most primitive and confused condition. D. G. ELLIOT's monograph *A Review of the Primates*, 3 vols., New York, 1913, upon which McDERMOTT relies as his authority, has done not a little to add to the general confusion. Here again McDERMOTT had no other choice than to resort to the best systematic work on the primates available, and for all its faults that is what ELLIOT's monograph still represents.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

a figure on a bowl dating from the eighth century before our era is called a " gorilla." Startling, because knowledge of the gorilla was not established until the year 1847, when SAVAGE and WYMAN published the first account of that anthropoid (6). There can be little question that the gorilla had been beheld by human eyes long before the establishment of its existence in 1847 by SAVAGE and WYMAN, but it is extremely unlikely that those eyes ever belonged to a person other than a native living in close proximity to the native habitat of this animal. It is even possible that juvenile specimens of gorilla had been seen by early occidental travellers or traders, but it is highly improbable that such persons ever beheld an adult specimen, for it is quite impossible, under ordinary conditions, to take an adult gorilla alive, and in its native habitat it can be seen only with the greatest difficulty (7). If such juvenile gorillas were ever observed then, their beholders left no account of them sufficiently precise to enable anyone to recognize the gorilla. There is, to be sure, HANNO's oft-quoted account, dating from the fifth century B.C., of his adventure with animals resembling anthropoids which have sometimes been identified with gorillas. These animals may quite well have been gorillas, and they may equally well have been chimpanzees, or any one of a number of other primates which are known from the parts of the coast of West Africa visited by HANNO. MCDERMOTT thinks it likely that these animals were gorillas. Here is the passage from HANNO :

" Following the rivers of fire for three further days, we reached a gulf named Southern Horn. In the gulf lay an island like the previous one, with a lake, and in it another island. The second island was full of wild people. By far the greater number were women with hairy bodies. Our interpreters called them Gorillas (*Γορίλλας*). We gave chase to the men, but could not catch any, for they all scampered up steep rocks and pelted us with

(6) T. S. SAVAGE and J. WYMAN, " Notice of the external characters and habits of *Troglodytes gorilla*, a new species of orang from the Gaboon River... Osteology of the same." *Boston. J. Nat. Hist., vol.* 5, pp. 417-443, 1847. " Orang," of course, was the general name for a man-like ape, and not the name. of the animal generically thus known.

(7) H. C. BINGHAM, *Gorillas in a native habitat*, Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication No. 426, August 1932; W. K. GREGORY and H. C. RAVEN, *In quest of gorillas*, New Bedford, Mass., 1937.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

stones. We secured three women, who bit and scratched and resisted their captors. But we killed and flayed them, and brought the hides to Carthage " (8).

The " Southern Horn " of HANNO's " Periplus " has been identified as Sherbro Sound, and the island in which lay another island as Macauley Island, which enfolds a smaller island in a tongue of sea, as at Orang (9), off the coast of West Africa.

The fact that HANNO's men encountered these animals as far west as Sierra Leone, a territory in which gorillas are not known to occur to-day, does not constitute a real objection to the suggestion that the animals may have been gorillas, since their range in former times may very well have been, and probably was, greater than it is to-day. That they were called " gorillas " by the interpreters may mean no more than that HANNO or his companions misheard or garbled a native term, for the word " gorilla " is not a word which occurs in any known African language. A common native name for the gorilla is *engena*, and for the chimpanzee, *engeco*. It is not difficult to understand how the term " gorilla " might have been derived from such a word as " engena," especially when the latter word is nasalized and glottalized, or in short, slurred. Pronounced in this way it sound something like *'n'g'lla*, from which " gorilla " would not be a difficult step. DU CHAILLU, the first white man to see the gorilla in its native habitat, states that the Mbondemo tribe called the gorilla " Nguyla," while the Mpongwe called it " Ngina." There probably exist many other variant forms of the native name for gorilla (10). Speculation, however, on the origin of the name gorilla will not greatly assist us in determining what anthropoid, if any, HANNO's men actually saw (11). The fact

(8) Translation from M. CARY and E. H. WARMINGTON, *The Ancient Explorers* London, 1929, p. 51. The Greek text and Latin translation will be found in CAROLUS MÜLLERUS, *Geographi Graeci Minores*, Parisiis, 1882, under " Periplus," pp. 13-14.

(9) See MUELLER, *loc. cit.*, and CARY and WARMINGTON, *loc. cit.*

(10) PAUL B. DU CHAILLU, *Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa*, London, 1861, p. 58.

(11) A. MER, *Mémoire sur le Périple d'Hannon*, Paris, 1885, p. 54, observes that "Il est remarquable que, dans la langue volofe, celle que parlaient probablement les interprètes d'Hannon, un grand singe se dit *goloh* ou *gorhl*, qui se rapproche singulièrement du mot gorille, dont se sert Hannon pour désigner ces animaux."

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

is that there exist a number of good reasons why HANNO's account suggests that the animals encountered by his party were probably not gorillas. In the first place, gorillas when pursued do not run away and then throw things at their pursuers,—they either run away, or else the leader of the small group stays to hold the enemy at bay while the rest make good their escape. The gorilla will attack only when he is seriously provoked (12). As CARY and WARMINGTON have pointed out in this connexion, "It is disputable whether these were a primitive race of human dwarfs, or, as seems more likely, chimpanzees, a tailless tribe, and eminently anthropoid, whose males are better runners than fighters. They were certainly not the powerful brutes whom we call gorillas. In that case all the scampering would have been done by HANNO's party" (13).

In the second place, any man who ever got within the range of an adolescent or mature female gorilla, would hardly be in a position to act as a "captor" or "conductor" to it,—he would literally be crushed. On the other hand, young chimpanzees might be approached with results such as HANNO relates.

MCDERMOTT refers to ELLIOT's presentation of DU CHAILLU's account of the capture of female gorillas by native hunters in order to eliminate the objection raised by the ferocity and strength of the gorilla. It is perhaps unfortunate that the testimony of DU CHAILLU should have been brought forward here, since the severe criticism to which that remarkable traveller's stories have been subjected do not lend them the kind of authority which we have a right to expect in matters of such a critical nature (14). Nonetheless, if we are to have DU CHAILLU's testimony it may

(12) PAUL DU CHAILLU, *loc. cit.*, pp. 58-72; THOMAS. S. SAVAGE, "Notice of the external character and habits of a new species of Troglodytes (*T. gorilla*, Savage) recently discovered by Dr. Savage near the river Gaboon, Africa." *Proc. Boston. Soc. Nat. Hist.*, vol. 2, pp. 245-247; R. HARTMANN, *Anthropoid Apes*. London, 1904, pp. 225-236; R. M. YERKES and A. W. YERKES, *loc. cit.*, pp. 401-411, in which will be found a complete account of the literature relating to the habits and mode of life of the gorilla.

(13) M. CARY and E. H. WARMINGTON, *loc. cit.*, p. 51.

(14) In fairness to DU CHAILLU it should be stated here that to what extent this criticism has been justly informed yet remains to be determined. As a devoted reader of DU CHAILLU I must confess that apart from the dramatic style of his writing I have never found him pulling a bow so long as to strain one's credulity.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

as well be pointed out here that in his first work DU CHAILLU, after considering HANNO's account in the "Periplus," came to the conclusion that the animals captured by his party were chimpanzees (15). In a later work DU CHAILLU modified this conclusion in favour of the gorilla. Since this statement is rarely referred to, I quote it here.

"After reconsidering the whole subject, I am compelled also to state that I think it highly probable that gorillas, and not chimpanzees, as I was formerly inclined to think, were the animals seen and captured by the Carthaginians under HANNO, as related in the 'Periplus.' Many circumstances combine in favour of this conclusion. One of the results of my late journey has been to prove that gorillas are nowhere more common than in the tract of land between the bend of Fernand Vaz and the seashore; and, as this land is chiefly of alluvial formation, and the bed of the river constantly shifting, it is extremely probable that there were islands here in the time of HANNO. The southerly part of the land is rather hilly, and, even if it were not then an island, the Carthaginians in rambling a short distance from the beach would see a broad water (the Fernand Vaz) beyond them, and would conclude that the land was an island.

"Gorillas are attracted to this district by the quantity of a little yellow berry called *mbimo*, growing there on a tree resembling the African teak, and by the abundance of two other kinds of fruits, of which they are very fond, and which grow on the sandy soil of this part of the coast-land..."

DU CHAILLU then quotes HANNO's passage from the "Periplus," and continues :

"These statements appear to me, with the fresh knowledge I have gained on the present expedition, to agree very well with the supposition that the bold Carthaginians reached the country near the mouth of the Fernand Vaz in their celebrated voyage, and that the hairy men and women met with were males and females of the *Troglodytes gorilla*. Even the name 'gorilla,' given to the animal in the 'Periplus,' is not very greatly different from its native name at the present day, 'ngina' or 'ngilla,' especially in the indistinct way in which it is sometimes pronounced. I

(15) DU CHAILLU, *loc. cit.*, pp. 343-345.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

now think it more likely that the gorilla was the animal seen and not the chimpanzee, which is generally less gregarious, and is not often found near the sea-coast. As to the theory that HANNO's hairy men were some species of baboon, I think that very unlikely; for why would the Carthaginians hang the skins in the temple of Juno on their return to Carthage, and preserve them for so many generations, as related by PLINY, if they were simply the skins of baboons, animals so common in Africa that they could scarcely have been considered as anything extraordinary by a nation of traders and travellers like the Carthaginians.

" The gorilla is of migratory habits at some seasons of the year. He is then not found in the districts usually resorted to by him when the berries, fruits, and nuts are in season " (16).

DU CHAILLU's statement that the gorilla is generally more gregarious than the chimpanzee is incorrect. Both animals live in small family bands (17). With respect to the capture of female gorillas by native hunters, in the passage referred to DU CHAILLU speaks of dead and wounded gorillas, and adds " this incident led me to modify somewhat the opinions I had expressed in ' Adventures in Equatorial Africa,' regarding some of the habits of the gorilla. I there said that I believed it impossible to capture an adult female alive, but I ought to have said wounded " (18).

It will be seen from these passages that DU CHAILLU is not really of much help. The evidence, such as it is, still favours the belief that the animals were chimpanzees rather than gorillas, but for all that it is not impossible that they were gorillas. But while we are on this subject, does it not appear strange that the following passage from the " Periplus " has been completely overlooked ?

„Τούτων δὲ καθύπερθεν Αἰθίοπες ὤκουν ἄξενοι, γῆν νεμόμενοι θηριώδη, διειλημμένην ὄρεσι μεγάλοις ἐξ ὧν ῥεῖν φασι τὸν Λίζον, περὶ δὲ τὰ ὄρη κατοικεῖν ἀνθρώπους ἀλλοιομόρφους, τρωγλοδύτας · οὓς ταχυτέρους ἵππων ἐν δρόμοις ἔφραζον οἱ Λιξται. " (19).

(16) PAUL B. DU CHAILLU, *A Journey To Ashango Land*, New York, 1867, pp. 56-58.

(17) R. M. YERKES and A. W. YERKES, *loc. cit.*, p.p 246-255, 430-441; H. C. BINGHAM, *loc. cit.*; and H. W. NISSEN, *A Field Study of the Chimpanzee*, Comparative Psychology Monographs, vol. 8, No. 1, Ser. No. 36, pp. 16-24,

(18) PAUL B. DU CHAILLU, " *A Journey to Ashango Land*," p.

(19) HANNO, *Periplus*, § 7, Editio CAROLUS MÜLLERUS, *loc. cit.*, p. 6

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

We wonder what the τρωγλοδύτης of this passage was. A chimpanzee possibly?

The first record after HANNO of an animal which might have been a gorilla is that given to PURCHAS by ANDREW BATTEL, who was for a time associated with the Portuguese in Angola early in the 17th Century (20). We need not reproduce the passage here. HARTMANN (21) and YERKES and YERKES (22) consider that the animals referred to in BATTEL's account may have been gorillas, but as the latter authors write, " even if we are correct in this surmise, we grant that knowledge of the African anthropoids was not advanced much by the BATTEL report " (23).

The second reference to what may have been a gorilla occurs in a famous work by Lord MONBODDO (24). In this work is printed a letter from a former " captain of a ship trading with the slave coast of Africa " in which an ' Impungu ' is described and compared with a ' Chimpenza.' It seems very probable that the ' Impungu ' referred to in this letter was the gorilla.

The third and final reference to what was probably the gorilla, before SAVAGE and WYMAN's proof of the actual existence of such an animal, occurs in BOWDICH's remarkable book published in 1819 (25). In this work BOWDICH speaks of the " Ingēna," concerning which he heard a great deal, but which he himself never saw. There is little doubt that the " Ingēna " of which he heard so much was the gorilla.

These three solitary references are all that we have from the time of HANNO up to the year 1847 when the existence of the gorilla was finally established.

It will now be obvious why MCDERMOTT's identification of a figure on an Eighth Century (B.C.) bowl from Cyprus as a gorilla is somewhat startling. If the animal shown on this bowl is a gorilla we would have to put the first definite record of this

(20) PURCHAS, *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas his Pilgrimes*, 4th Edition, 1625, vol. 2, pp. 981-982.

(21) HARTMANN, *loc. cit.*, p. 4.

(22) YERKES and YERKES, *loc. cit.*, p. 10.

(23) *Ibid.*

(24) Lord MONBODDO, *The Origin and Progress of Language*, London, 1774, vol. 1, p. 281; Cf. YERKES and YERKES, *loc. cit.*, p. 23.

(25) T. E. BOWDICH, *Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashantee*, London, 1819, pp. 440-441; YERKES and YERKES, *loc. cit.*, p. 31.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

animal back by more than two thousand years. It is therefore not without some importance to determine whether or not the figure depicted on this bowl is a gorilla.

McDERMOTT makes the claim that the gorilla is depicted on two separate bowls which probably came from the same Phoenician-Cypriote workship. The first is a shallow silver bowl (26) recovered from the Bernardini tomb at Praeneste (Palestrina) in 1876, and now in the Museo Preistorico at Rome, and the second a bowl from the Cyprian Curium (27) now in The Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York. These two bowls have already on several occasions formed the subject of discussion as to whether or not the gorilla was meant to be portrayed in either of them. I shall refer to these discussions below. The main scene of the Bernardini bowl is thus described by McDERMOTT :

" 1. A hunter who wears semi-oriental dress is driven out of a walled city by a female chariot driver... 2. The hunter has roused a stag which leaps from the top of a rocky hill. 3. The hunter has climbed the hill and mortally wounded the stag. 4. The chariot driver has unharnessed and is feeding the horses, while the hunter cuts up the deer. 5. The hunter seated on a stool is about to dine. On a stand in front of him is a dish of venison, on another a bowl of wine. Above is a winged sun-disc watching over the feast. From a cave in the side of a hill a gorilla reaches out to steal the meat. This scene presumably is the midday meal. 6. The gorilla has now come out of the cave and holds in its right forepaw a purloined bowl of wine, in its left a branch of a tree. The older interpretation that the animal is attacking by throwing a rock is incorrect. The hunter notices the theft and invokes the aid of his god. This deity, pictured with broad wings and face in full view, carries the hunter and his chariot in pursuit of the gorilla... 7. The hunter in his chariot, again on the ground, pursues the gorilla, which stumbles and falls in its flight. 8. The hunter now dismounted dispatches

(26) No. 329 in McDERMOTT's Catalogue, pp. 234-238, where the full bibliography relating to the bowl is given together with a complete description of the latter.

(27) No. 330 in McDERMOTT's Catalogue, p. 238.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the animal with his axe. 9. The hunter returns to the city in the evening " (28).

The Bernardini bowl was not readily available for examination, but the bowl at New York was. By the courtesy of the authorities of The Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York, this precious work was removed from its exhibition case in the Gold Room of the Cesnola Collection and made available to me for examination (29). Following my examination of the bowl, the Museum, at my request, made a special photograph of the part of the bowl referred to in McDERMOTT's description, and by their kind permission I am able to reproduce this excellent photograph here. The Cyprian bowl, as McDERMOTT points out, is so similar to the Bernardini bowl in practically all details, " that they probably came from the same workshop "... " The differences in the second part of the outside band will be noted. The gorilla, holding the bowl, is just coming from the cave in the hill instead of standing in front of it. When the king is attacking, the gorilla is not crouching but has its forepaws down on another mound. In the next scene the gorilla has its arms bound. As a whole the scene is less lifelike and less vigorous " (30).

Now, what shall we say of the two hunted figures on each side of the mound (scenes 7 and 8) in the photograph below? I suggest that anything we might say of them would be little more than guesswork. In the Bernardini bowl these figures have been variously identified as a mandrill (31), a gorilla (32), a bestial monster (33) or simply as a monster (34). HELBIG (35) considered that this figure was probably intended to represent a dog-headed baboon. MARQUAND is of the opinion that the figure in the

(28) McDERMOTT, *loc. cit.*, pp. 235-236.

(29) I am particularly indebted to Mr. FIELDMAN of the Department of Classical Archaeology for his many courtesies in this connexion.

(30) McDERMOTT, *loc. cit.*, pp. 237-238.

(31) BOLL, *Annali*, XLVIII, 1876, p. 226.

(32) C. CLERMONT-GANNEAU, " La coupe phénicienne de Palestrina," *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 7, vol. 9, 1878, pp. 247-270.

(33) F. POULSEN, " Der Orient und die fruehgriechische Kunst," Berlin, 1912, pp. 24-25.

(34) C. D. CURTIS, " The Bernardini Tomb," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, vol. 3, 1919, pp. 41-42.

(35) HELBIG, *Bull. d'Inst.*, vol. 6, 1876, pp. 126-128.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

FIG. 1. Detail of bowl from Curium, Cyprus. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Cesnola Collection, 4556. (Diameter 21 cm.). Slightly reduced. Reproduced by the kind permission of The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Curium bowl does not represent a gorilla, but a hairy troglodyte (36). MYRES terms the figure a giant (37).

I do not propose to venture a guess as to the nature of this creature. Certainly I cannot see any good reason for assuming that the creature represents, or was intended to represent, a gorilla. MCDERMOTT writes "It is obvious... that this is not a perfectly lifelike depiction of a gorilla. The arms are too short, the legs are too long and well-formed, the head is too large, the beard and hindpaws are too human. None the less the complete hairiness of the body, the massive size, the forepaws, and most of all the general appearance point to the gorilla." (38).

Allowing for the inaccuracy of the artist, it is difficult to see why all these features do not point with even greater force to a bestial monster or a giant. What, in any event, would knowledge of the gorilla be doing in Cyprus some 2600 miles away from the nearest known range of the gorilla? Or in Phoenicia, almost as far away? Or in Egypt? Is it possible that some Cypriote or Phoenician trader or traveller brought the knowledge of this animal back with him from equatorial Africa, and that the creator of these bowls portrayed these animals to the best of his ability from the description given by such an individual? The answer is that it is not impossible, but that we do not know. On the other hand, where would a king, who has conjecturally been identified with the mythical founder of Cyprus, namely CINYRAS (39), be found hunting "gorillas"? And in his chariot? Surely not in equatorial Africa? And as surely not in Egypt, Phoenicia, or Cyprus? Is it not more likely that the scenes depicted in these bowls are not intended to be historical representations of events, but the pictorial representation of a myth? That all the figures depicted in these scenes are mythical, and that the so-called "gorilla" is really a mythical monster, half man and half beast, and that if this is so the resemblance to the gorilla or to any other primate would in any event necessarily

(36) A. MARQUAND, "A Silver Patera from Kourion," *American Journal of Archaeology*, vol. 3, 1887, pp. 322-337.

(37) J. L. MYRES, *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus*, New York, 1914, pp. 463-464.

(38) MCDERMOTT, *loc. cit.*, pp. 236-237.

(39) *Loc. cit.*, p. 335.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

be striking? I suggest that in the circumstances this is the most reasonable view to take of the nature of this creature. Whatever this creature was intended to represent there appears to be good reason to believe that the artist placed it in a habitat which is peculiar to an ape with which he was very probably acquainted. Thus, the fact that the creatures shown in the bowls possess an elongate nose (muzzle), and that they are shown emerging from a cave situated in a rocky region strongly suggests the baboon *Papio hamadryas*, who is well covered with hair, and possesses a pretty mane—all characters delineated in the bowls. The hamadryas baboon lives among the rocky fastnesses of Abyssinia. The gorilla positively does not live in caves or among rocks, but in the open forest. These statements also apply to another group of figures which McDERMOTT thinks to represent gorillas. These figures are on a terracotta relief in the Berlin Antiquarium (Inv. 31276); this terracotta is of Egyptian origin. Here according to McDERMOTT " A female gorilla, holding two young gorillas, sits on a rock at the opening of a cave " (40).

Without adding any further to this tedious discussion, I think we may legitimately conclude that the figures on the bowls from Praeneste and Cypriote Curium do not in the least throw any light on the knowledge possessed by the ancients of the apes in general and of the anthropoids in particular. And finally, that the creatures depicted in these scenes were probably not intended to represent gorillas.

There are one or two other matters in McDERMOTT's book which may be profitably discussed here.

In commenting upon AGATHARCHIDES' description of the sacred baboon of Egypt (*Papio hamadryas*, Abyssinia), McDERMOTT writes " The statement that the womb of the female hangs outside the body must be due to observation of a diseased animal, or to confusion with the ischial callosities which are present in this species " (41).

Since McDERMOTT does not give the relevant passage in his text I do so here.

---

(40) McDERMOTT, *loc. cit.*, pp. 296-297.
(41) McDERMOTT, *loc. cit.*, p. 66.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

„περὶ μὲν τὸν ἄρρενα ταῦτα· τῷ δὲ θήλει πρόσκειται καὶ τὸ τὴν μήτραν ἔξω τοῦ σώματος φορεῖν καὶ οὕτω διάγεσθαι πάντα τὸν βίον." (42).

It appears to me more likely that what AGATHARCHIDES was here describing, in his statement that the womb of the female hangs outside the body, is the sexual skin of the female baboon at the time of its maximum enlargement. In the female baboon the swelling of the sexual skin frequently reaches enormous proportions, and to anyone unacquainted with the normal anatomy of the animal this swelling would certainly suggest what it suggested to AGATHARCHIDES (43). In this account AGATHARCHIDES has probably given what is the first record of the sexual skin phenomenon in the primates. In many primates, but particularly in the hamadryas baboon, of which AGATHARCHIDES was speaking, the subcutaneous regions of the perineum and adjacent areas become tremendously enlarged and reddened, so that the animal gives the appearance of housing the greater part of its urogenital apparatus in this greatly swollen and apparently pendulous body. This was probably the phenomenon which AGATHARCHIDES was unconsciously describing when he noted the external position of the womb in the female baboon.

MCDERMOTT refers to ARISTOTLE's reference to the χοιροπίθηκος, the " pig-ape " (44), and states that this animal cannot be identified (45). As a matter of fact I think ARISTOTLE's χοιροπίθηκος can be identified with a probability that amounts to practical certainly. *Papio porcarius* (variously known in the older literature as *cynocephalus porcarius*, *simia porcarius*, *cynocephalus ursinus*, and in common parlance as the chacma) " the pig-ape or baboon," has a physiognomy which is very pig-like, its snout protruding above its upper lip. This animal is found throughout the greater part of South Africa south of the Limpopo

(42) *Ex Agatharchidis De Mari Erythraeo Libris Excerpta*, Editio CAROLUS MÜLLERUS, Geographi Graeci Minores, Parisis, 1882, vol, I, § 74, p. 160.

(43) The sexual skin is that part of the skin, usually the perineal part, which during the sexual cycle undergoes reddening and swells. This phenomenon is sporadically distributed among the primates. See S. ZUCKERMAN, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, London and New York, 1932, in which the sexual skin swelling of the baboon is described as reaching " relatively enormous " proportions, pp. 92-93, and also the same author's *Functional Affinities of Man, Monkeys, and Apes*, London and New York, 1933, pp. 40-47.

(44) ARISTOTLE, *Historia Animalium*, Lib. 2, Cap. 11.

(45) MCDERMOTT, *loc. cit.*, p. 93.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

River. When young it makes an excellent and intelligent pet; with age its temper suffers a change for the worse, and it becomes a ferocious and dangerous animal. There is some evidence that juvenile individuals of this species found their way to Alexandria at an early period. EHRENBERG reports seeing examples of this species in that city during the early part of the last century (46). We have not far to go, therefore, to account for ARISTOTLE's acquaintance (or for his informant's acquaintance) with this ape. As supporting this identification of χοιροπίθηκος with *P. porcarius* may be cited the fact that when discussing the chameleon ARISTOTLE curiously remarks that " its face is like that of the choeropithecus " (47). The common chameleon (*Chamaeleon chamaeleon*) which is found in the countries bordering the Mediterranean has a sort of snub-faced head which may very well be likened in appearance to that of the chacma. It appears that in this passage ARISTOTLE wished to emphasize the snub-facedness of the chameleon and hence suggested that condition by comparing its face with that of the choeropithecus. Had he wished to make the reference to a long-snouted animal he would surely have made the comparison with the cynocephalus ape, that is, the hamadryas baboon which is distinguished by its elongate dog-like snout. For this reason it is difficult to accept LESSON's early, unsupported identification of choeropithecus with the hamadryas baboon (" Papion des anciens, Hamadryas choeropithecus ") (48). On the other hand, while by no means certain of the species of ape intended by ARISTOTLE's choeropithecus, REICHENBACH (49) refers to the chacma as *Choiropithecus porcarius*, as if to rub the fact of its piggishness doubly in; while BENNETT (50), to whose work he refers, spoke of this animal as Cynocephalus porcarius, " the pig-faced baboon."

Philadelphia. M. F. ASHLEY MONTAGU.

(46) C. G. EHRENBERG, *Naturgeschichtliche Reisen durch Nord-Afrika und West-Asien in den Jahren* 1820 *bis* 1825 *von Dr. W. F. Hemprich und Dr. C. G. Ehrenberg*, Berlin, Posen und Bromberg, 1828.

(47) ARISTOTLE, *loc. cit.*, Lib. 2, Cap. 7.

(48) M. R.-P. LESSON, *Species des mammifères bimanes et quadrumanes*, Paris et Londres, 1840, pp. 109-110.

(49) H. G. L. REICHENBACH, *Die vollständigste Naturgeschichte der Affen*, Dresden, 1863, pp. 151-152.

(50) E. T. Bennett, *The Tower Menagerie*, London, 1829, pp. 147-148.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.180 on Fri, 9 May 2014 16:02:57 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions